

Speeches - DCI

14 April 1961

MEMORANDUM FOR THE DIRECTOR:

1. This memorandum is for information only.
2. The White House has cleared the text of your speech as presented without comment.
3. Mr. Francis Herron of State's Policy Plans and Guidance Staff is in a "quandary" on the broad issue of whether any senior official of the U. S. government should be giving speeches attacking Communists at this time; there is an internal State Department practice, stemming from Mr. Charles Bohlen, that senior State department officials should not be giving such speeches at this time. There are two considerations: (a) An injunction, attributed to the White House, of "civility" toward Russia in public speeches; and (b) State officials themselves have so far made "no speech" on this subject in Kennedy's administration.
4. The comments of Soviet experts in State are as follows:
Page 3, line 5 from the bottom of the page. The passage about the Sino-Soviet rift and the Chinese "recalcitrance" is all regarded as contra-productive. Similarly regarded are passages on the Sino-Soviet rift on page 6, page 10, (paragraph 1), and on page 19.
Page 4, line 3. "Well-intentioned people" is suggested as alternative to "our friends" because the latter implies, erroneously, governments rather than peoples.
Page 4, last line. Instead of "our Western civilization" omit "Western" or substitute "free world" so as not to give offense to our friends outside the West.
Page 7, last paragraph and page 9, entire page. This lengthy discussion of so-called Russian progress for over 40 years since 1917, if quoted out of context by the Russians later, will have us repeating NK's line. State questions, "Why repeat NK's line?"

Page 11. Statement that Soviet military strength is "roughly equivalent to our own." Whether this means U.S. or allied strength, this gives the impression that Soviet strength is really not so bad; that they have only "parity" while our U.S. position has generally been to point out the aggressive military posture of the Soviet Union.

Page 16. Soviet bloc "aid." The word "aid" has a favorable connotation whereas the Russians are really not giving aid but frequently are asking in exchange through barter areas, etc., all manner of quid pro quo. Some 8 countries are named here, including Argentina and Egypt, which might resent the implication that they are being brought closer into the Soviet orbit by so-called Soviet bloc "aid."

Page 17, last 3 lines. The statement, "Emerging countries ... may feel that Communism is their only clear choice," gives an undesirable, negative suggestion to the peoples of those countries.

Page 20, line 5. "Eastern Germany" should read "Soviet zone Germany."

Page 25. Suggest deleting two sentences beginning at line 7 from the bottom:

- (1) "We have not been devoting ourselves to tearing down Communism in the Soviet Union."
- (2) "We do not believe that this is their own free choice, but if not, they should move to reject it." State questions whether we should be discussing the internal affairs of the Soviet Union.

Page 27. Passage about Suslov's recent visit to India. State questions whether Indians will not resent our seeming to needle them on this and asks, "Should we not let Indians handle this?"

5. One additional review remains, by Mr. Behlen. As of 6:15 P.M. tonight he was quoted as saying, "This is a foreign policy speech," and he will want to take a look at it. I am to have word by 10 A.M. Saturday from Mr. Burriss's office on this point.